

Federal Railroad Administration
Pelham Bay Bridge Replacement
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

October 2025



Prepared Pursuant to 42 USC § 4321 et seq.
Prepared By the U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)
and Amtrak



Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Selected Alternative.....	4
3. Determinations and Findings Regarding Other Laws	5
3.1 Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.....	11
3.2 Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966.....	11
3.3 Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.....	12
4. Coordination and Consultation	12
5. Summary of Comments and Responses	13
6. FRA Finding of No Significant Impact.....	17

Appendices

APPENDIX A Comments Received on the EA
APPENDIX B Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement
APPENDIX C Section 4(f) *de minimis* Concurrence Letter

Tables

Table 3-1. Environmental Impact Determination and Mitigation Measures	6
---	---

Figures

Figure 1: Project Location.....	4
---------------------------------	---

1. Introduction

The United States Department of Transportation's (USDOT) Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), in cooperation with National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak), prepared an Environmental Assessment¹ (EA) to evaluate potential impacts to the human and natural environment from construction and operation for the Pelham Bay Bridge Replacement Project (Project). Amtrak, as the owner of the existing railroad bridge, project sponsor, and recipient of federal grant funding, is proposing to replace the existing Pelham Bay Bridge with a new two-track bridge located immediately south (downstream) of the existing bridge. The existing Pelham Bay Bridge is located across the Hutchinson River, in the Bronx, in New York City, New York, between the Co-op City neighborhood and Pelham Bay Park, on the Hell Gate Line (HGL) on the Northeast Corridor (NEC) (see **Figure 1**). FRA is the lead federal agency for the Project under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and the United States Coast Guard (USCG) and the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) are cooperating agencies in the NEPA process.

The existing Pelham Bay Bridge was built in 1907 and is eligible for listing on the National and State Registers of Historic Places. It is a two-track bridge with a movable span and has been in service for 117 years. The bridge is owned by Amtrak and is currently used by 51 Amtrak intercity passenger rail trains daily and two CSX freight rail trains per week. The number of trains crossing the bridge is expected to increase in the future.² The bridge is reaching the end of its useful life, resulting in bridge failures and frequent closures for maintenance. The bridge is also functionally obsolete due to its limited design speed and narrow navigable channel that requires frequent openings to allow the passage of maritime traffic on the Hutchinson River, which causes disruptions in passenger and freight rail operations.

The EA was prepared in accordance with NEPA (42 USC § 4321 et seq.) and FRA's implementing regulations at 23 CFR Part 771; 23 USC § 139; Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act of 1966; Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act; the Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, and other federal environmental review requirements. FRA signed the EA on June 13, 2025, and made the document and associated technical reports available for public review and comment on June 17, 2025. FRA posted the EA on Regulations.gov and on the FRA website: <https://railroads.dot.gov/rail-network-development/environment/environmental-reviews/pelham-bay-bridge-replacement-project>. Additionally, Amtrak posted the EA on its website at [Amtraknewera.com/Pelham-Bay-Bridge/](https://www.amtraknewera.com/Pelham-Bay-Bridge/). Amtrak circulated electronic copies of the EA to a stakeholder mailing list and distributed hard copies to publicly accessible facilities near the Project site including the Bronx Borough President's Office, Pelham Bay Park Administrator's Office, Baychester Library, Pelham Bay Library, and the Co-op City-Riverbay Corporation Community Relations Department. Hard copies were also made available to review agencies upon request. The 30-day public comment period for the EA closed on July 17, 2025. FRA and Amtrak reviewed and addressed comments as appropriate before FRA made this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). This FONSI incorporates the EA by reference.

¹ FRA and Amtrak. 2025. Environmental Assessment for Pelham Bay Bridge Replacement Project. Signed June 13, 2025.

² Amtrak plans on increasing weekday train service to 60 trains per day, CSX, which operates two weekly freight trains during non-peak hours, plans on increasing its freight trains to three per week. Additionally, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) is currently constructing infrastructure for the Penn Station Access project that will bring MTA Metro-North train service into Penn Station, adding up to 102 new daily trains along the Hell Gate Line between Penn Station in New York City, New York and New Haven, Connecticut and over the Pelham Bay Bridge.

Figure 1: Project Location



2. Selected Alternative

As described in Chapter 2.2 of the EA, Amtrak developed multiple alignment options that would fulfill the purpose and need of the Project. A series of screening criteria were used for evaluation of the alternatives, including operational reliability, travel speeds, maritime navigation and safety, compatibility with the New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority's Penn Station Access (PSA) project, impacts to freight rail alignment, construction period impacts, and future construction of additional passenger rail tracks. Based on these criteria, FRA and Amtrak identified Alternative 2B as the Selected Alternative that best meets the purpose and need of the Project (referred to as the Preferred Alternative).

As described in Chapter 2.4 of the EA, the Preferred Alternative consists of a new two-track, mid-level movable bridge across the Hutchinson River. The Preferred Alternative will be constructed directly south of the existing bridge, while maintaining and operating the existing Pelham Bay Bridge and maintaining both existing train and maritime traffic. The proposed bridge will provide navigation improvements through vertical clearance of 35 feet above the mean high water and horizontal clearance of 100 feet, which will reduce the number of bridge openings compared to existing bridge operations and allow for an increase in passenger train operating speed from 45 mph to 70 mph with only minor impacts to freight train traffic and an alignment compatible with the PSA project.

The Preferred Alternative will extend from east to west, from the Pelhamdale Avenue overhead Bridge (Amtrak MP 17.87) to the Pelham interlocking (Amtrak MP 14.8), with a movable bridge span of 140 feet in length. The total bridge length will be approximately 3,550 feet. There will be a total of approximately 1,430 feet of retaining walls, with 690 feet of retaining walls on the west approach and 740 feet of retaining walls on the east approach. The Preferred Alternative will also include removal of the existing bridge after the new bridge is constructed and put into service, cutting the existing piers at ground level, removal of the transmission towers, realignment of the existing tracks, and modifications to existing infrastructure such as replacing the catenary structures and other power and signal equipment to support construction of the new bridge.

FRA identified the Build Alternative as the Preferred Alternative and now as the Selected Alternative in this FONSI.

Amtrak anticipates construction of the Project to begin in 2029 and end in 2034.

3. Determinations and Findings Regarding Other Laws

To determine any potential significant impacts of the Project on the human and natural environment, Amtrak compared the future conditions with the Preferred Alternative to the No Build Alternative. Under the No Build Alternative, the existing, aging Pelham Bay Bridge would continue to operate as it does today with regular maintenance (likely more frequently) to ensure it is safe and to keep the movable span machinery properly functioning. However, this alternative would not include any substantial improvements to the bridge. Under the No Build Alternative, the vertical clearance under the bridge would remain the same, requiring it to open for most vessels through the channel and the horizontal clearance of the navigation channel would remain narrow, contributing to vessel collisions. As discussed above, the Preferred Alternative would increase the vertical clearance and horizontal clearance under the bridge, as compared to the No Build Alternative, reducing the number of bridge openings and improving maritime safety.

The potential for the Preferred Alternative to result in impacts to the human and natural environment is discussed in Chapter 3 of the EA. The Preferred Alternative will result in impacts to environmental resources as summarized in **Table 3-1**, none of which will be significant. Amtrak is also required to implement the mitigation measures specified in **Table 3-1**. Findings for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966, and Section 6(f) of the Land Water Conservation Fund Act are further detailed in Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, respectively.

Based upon the EA and a review of the comments received during the public comment period, FRA has concluded that the Project is not likely to result in significant environmental impacts. FRA considered measures to mitigate and minimize adverse impacts, which Amtrak will incorporate to the extent possible and practicable or required. FRA's determination for each resource area and mitigation measures, if applicable, are presented in **Table 3-1** below.

Table 3-1. Environmental Impact Determination and Mitigation Measures

Amtrak is responsible for implementing the measures in the table below.

Environmental Resource	Impacts	Determination of Significant Adverse Impact (Yes/No)	Mitigation Measures
Transportation (EA Section 3.1)	<p>Reduced delays in rail service, increased rail speeds over the bridge, and less frequent maritime vehicle collisions.</p> <p>During construction, temporary increase in vehicular traffic but no impact to navigation channel.</p> <p><i>No change since publication of the EA.</i></p>	No	Use existing NYCDOT-designated truck routes for vehicular traffic during construction.
Socioeconomic Conditions (EA Section 3.2)	<p>Long term socioeconomic benefits due to improved passenger and freight rail service and reduced maritime vessel collisions.</p> <p><i>No change since publication of the EA.</i></p>	No	None.
Land Use, Zoning and Community Facilities (EA Section 3.3)	<p>No impact to development patterns, residences, businesses, zoning or community facilities. Permanent, maintenance and temporary easements in Pelham Bay Park will not adversely affect park land use.</p> <p><i>No change since publication of the EA.</i></p>	No	Implement mitigation identified through Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) consultations.
Visual and Aesthetic Conditions (EA Section 3.4)	<p>Overall improvement in the visual and aesthetic quality and character of the Study Area.</p> <p><i>No change since publication of the EA.</i></p>	No	None.

Pelham Bay Bridge Replacement
 Finding of No Significant Impact
 October 2025

Environmental Resource	Impacts	Determination of Significant Adverse Impact (Yes/No)	Mitigation Measures
Cultural Resources (EA Section 3.5)	Adverse Effect to NR-eligible Amtrak Pelham Bay Railroad Bascule Bridge; No Adverse Effect to NR-eligible Pelham Bay Park Historic District, Co-op City or Shore Road Bridge. No change since publication of the EA. Section 106 Initiation Letter – April 5, 2023; FRA's Finding of Adverse Effect – June 12, 2024; NYSHPO concurrence with FRA's Finding of Adverse Effect – July 12, 2024; MOA executed – March 21, 2025 (see Appendix B).	No	(1) Recordation of the Amtrak Pelham Bay Railroad Bascule Bridge—Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) Level II recordation. (2) Preparation of an illustrated pamphlet containing basic information about the history and significance of the Amtrak Pelham Bay Railroad Bascule Bridge within the larger context of the electrification of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad. (3) Conduct geotechnical soil borings by qualified archaeologist and archaeologist field testing, if required, to indicate areas of potential NRHP-eligible archaeological resources. (4) Construct noise barriers in the vicinity of the Bronx Equestrian Center, on the bridge structure, and adjacent to the railroad tracks. (5) Replant vegetation in areas where there is temporary right-of-way acquisition and vegetation removal within the Pelham Bay Historic District. (6) Implement BMPs to minimize construction noise, and other measures and processes as agreed to in the Section 106 MOA.
Air Quality and Energy (EA Section 3.6)	No change in long-term mobile source or stationary air pollutant emissions and negligible change in energy consumption. Total annual estimated emissions as a result of construction will be less than the general conformity <i>de minimis</i> thresholds. No change since publication of the EA.	No	None.
Noise and Vibration (EA Section 3.7)	First-row receptor sites on the northern facing Co-op City neighborhood will experience noise exposure in the FTA Moderate Impact range; the Bronx Equestrian Center within Pelham Bay Park will experience noise exposure within the FTA Severe impact range. Vibration impacts are below the threshold. Construction activities will not exceed FTA impact thresholds for noise and vibration. No change since publication of the EA.	No	Construct four noise barriers totaling 3,950 feet to mitigate all impacts to moderate or below.

Pelham Bay Bridge Replacement
 Finding of No Significant Impact
 October 2025

Environmental Resource	Impacts	Determination of Significant Adverse Impact (Yes/No)	Mitigation Measures
Terrestrial Resource (EA Section 3.8)	Disturbance of approximately 1.1 acres of vegetated areas (trees and shrubs). <i>Area of temporary impacts to Pelham Bay Park reduced by 0.03 acres since publication of the EA to avoid additional trees following consultation with NYCDPR Bronx Forestry.</i>	No	(1) Replant temporarily disturbed areas in coordination with NYC Parks as appropriate. (2) Revised alignment and protective measures incorporated into the project design to avoid and minimize tree impacts in Pelham Bay Park. (3) If osprey nests are found on existing catenary structures; they will be removed outside of the breeding season (April 1 to September 30) if possible. However, if work is to be performed around the osprey nest when it is active, a Depredation Permit will be obtained from the USFWS prior to the initiation of the work.
Floodplains (EA Section 3.8)	Permanent impact to 1.9 acres of 100- year floodplain and temporary impact to 12 acres of 100-year floodplain; permanent impacts will be offset by removal of infrastructure associated with existing bridge from within the floodplain. Movable portion of replacement bridge and associated machinery will be elevated above 1 percent flood hazard elevation through the 2100s. <i>No change since publication of the EA.</i>	No	None
Coastal Zone (EA Section 3.8)	The Project is within the New York State and New York City coastal zone boundary and is consistent with the New York State and Coastal Management Policies and New York City Waterfront Revitalization Program. <i>No change since publication of the EA.</i>	No	Comply with federal coastal zone consistency requirements to be identified during the Project's final design and permitting phase, prior to initiation of construction.
Wetlands (EA Section 3.8)	Permanent impact to 0.7 acres of wetlands (0.07 acres emergent wetlands, 0.07 acres mudflat, 0.35 acres shallow water, 0.21 acres open water); temporary impacts to an additional 8.3 acres of wetlands (0.75 acres emergent wetlands, 1.52 acres mudflat, 3.93 acres shallow water, 2.14 open water). <i>Areas of impact revised since publication of the EA to reflect updated wetlands delineation performed in May 2025, in coordination with NYCDPR.</i>	No	(1) Use in-kind mitigation (on-site or off-site) or mitigation banking to compensate for permanent impacts, to be determined during the Project's final design and permitting phase. (2) Amtrak will restore areas of temporary impacts to at least pre-existing conditions following construction, in coordination with the New York City Department of Parks (NYCDPR).

Pelham Bay Bridge Replacement
 Finding of No Significant Impact
 October 2025

Environmental Resource	Impacts	Determination of Significant Adverse Impact (Yes/No)	Mitigation Measures
<p>Aquatic Resources (EA Section 3.8)</p>	<p>Impact to 9.05 acres of Essential Fish Habitat (EFH)/Habitat Area of Particular Concern, including 0.70 acres of permanent impacts and 8.33 acres of temporary impacts. Potential for temporary impacts to resident and migratory fish species from suspended sediments or underwater noise during construction. Adverse effect on EFH will not be substantial, with conservation measures recommended by NOAA. Consultation concluded January 13, 2025.</p> <p><i>No change since publication of the EA.</i></p>	<p>No</p>	<p>(1) Use in-kind mitigation (on-site & off-site) or mitigation banking for permanent impacts to 0.07 acres of tidal mudflats and other aquatic habitats, to be determined during the Project's final design and permitting phase. (2) Adhere to seasonal in-water work restrictions, and utilize vibratory hammer to the maximum extent practicable, and underwater noise attenuating tools if an impact hammer is necessary. (3) Ensure that work barges float during all stages of the tide (i.e., do not sit grounded on river bottom).</p>
<p>Endangered, Threatened and Special Concern Species (EA Section 3.8)</p>	<p>Potential for temporary impacts to seven federally listed species and one proposed listed species. There may be an adverse impact to tricolored bat summer habitat due to tree clearing; there is no suitable breeding habitat for Piping plover in the action area; the four turtle species may have potential impact from noise/vibration during construction, vessel strikes and temporary turbidity; and the shortnose sturgeon and Atlantic sturgeon may have potential impacts from suspended sediments and underwater noise during construction.</p> <p>ESA Section 7 determination of "not likely to adversely affect" any ESA-listed species or designated habitat under the jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation concluded November 22, 2024.</p> <p><i>No change since publication of the EA.</i></p>	<p>No</p>	<p>FRA's ESA Section 7 consultation with NOAA-NMFS resulted in the following mitigation: seasonal work restrictions and the utilization of cofferdams, turbidity curtains, and silt curtains.</p>
<p>Contaminated Materials (EA Section 3.9)</p>	<p>Potential to encounter contamination during soil or sediment disturbance activities. Suspect asbestos containing materials and lead paint to be disturbed during demolition of existing bridge.</p> <p><i>No change since publication of the EA.</i></p>	<p>No</p>	<p>A Phase II sampling investigation of soil, groundwater, and river sediment will be performed prior to construction. Proper material handling and disposal, and health and safety procedures will be followed if contaminated materials are encountered during construction.</p>
<p>Section 4(f) (EA Section 3.10)</p>	<p>Pelham Bay Railroad Bascule Bridge (historic property) – excepted from Section 4(f) approval.</p> <p>Pelham Bay Park – <i>De minimis</i> impact determination – October 8, 2025 (see Appendix C)</p> <p><i>Area of temporary impacts to Pelham Bay Park reduced by 0.03 acres since publication of the EA to avoid trees following consultation with NYCDPR Bronx Forestry.</i></p>	<p>No</p>	<p>In coordination with NYCDPR, develop mitigation measures to minimize impact on the Pelham Bay Park, including, but not limited to restoring temporary construction areas within the Park, developing a maintenance of traffic plan for Park roads and trails affected by construction, use of protective matting for tree critical root zones during construction, and complying with local tree replacement laws.</p>

Pelham Bay Bridge Replacement
 Finding of No Significant Impact
 October 2025

Environmental Resource	Impacts	Determination of Significant Adverse Impact (Yes/No)	Mitigation Measures
Section 6(f) (EA Section 3.11)	Impact to 3.98 acres of LWCF funded Pelham Bay Park requiring a Section 6(f) conversion. <i>Area of temporary impacts to Pelham Bay Park reduced by 0.03 acres since publication of the EA to avoid trees following consultation with NYCDPR Bronx Forestry.</i>	No	Acquisition of a replacement property requiring conversion under Section 6(f) of LWCF Act. Amtrak, in conjunction with the NYCDPR, have coordinated in the identification of potential replacement properties in proximity to Pelham Bay Park. A potential suitable replacement property on City Island in the Bronx has been identified; Amtrak will continue coordination to identify other possible properties and to meet Section 6(f) conversion requirements. Consistent with Section 6(f) requirements, the replacement property will take place after FRA issues its NEPA decision document but prior to the conversion.

3.1. SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT

FRA delineated an area of potential effect (APE) for the above-ground work as a 500-foot radius around the entire Project area (proposed new bridge and approaches), as explained in a letter to the New York State Historic Preservation Office (NYSHPO), invited consulting parties and four federally recognized Indian tribes dated April 5, 2023. In a letter to SHPO and consulting parties dated June 12, 2024, FRA expanded the above-ground APE to extend farther to the northeast and southwest due to the inclusion of additional retaining walls and noise barriers that were incorporated into the design. FRA's June 12, 2024, letter also delineated the below-ground APE, which coincides with the limits of disturbance for the Project, combining all of the permanent and temporary ground disturbance locations. The vertical extent of the below-ground APE (depth below grade) varies depending on the component of the Project (between 10 and 40 feet).

FRA determined that four properties in the above-ground APE are considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) for the purposes of this Section 106 undertaking pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(c)(2). The properties are: Amtrak Pelham Bay Railroad Bascule Bridge, Pelham Bay Park Historic District, Shore Road Bridge (aka Pelham Bay Bridge), and Co-op City Historic District. SHPO concurred with FRA's NRHP eligibility determinations in letters dated April 25, 2023 and July 12, 2024.

FRA found that the Preferred Alternative will alter the qualifying characteristics of the Amtrak Pelham Bay Railroad Bascule Bridge in a manner that will diminish its integrity and will have an Adverse Effect on this historic property. FRA found that the Preferred Alternative will have No Adverse Effect on the Shore Road Bridge and Co-op City. FRA also found the Preferred Alternative will have No Adverse Effect on the Pelham Bay Park Historic District with the following conditions: Amtrak will implement noise abatement measures in the vicinity of the Bronx Equestrian Center and best management practices to minimize construction noise, and Amtrak will restore vegetation in areas where temporary right-of-way is needed for construction.

FRA drafted a memorandum of agreement (MOA) in consultation with Amtrak, NY SHPO, and the additional Section 106 consulting parties to resolve adverse effects of the Preferred Alternative to historic properties. Amtrak, as the project sponsor, will implement all mitigation and avoidance measures stipulated in the MOA.

Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1), FRA notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation of its Adverse Effect finding on September 23, 2024. The ACHP responded on October 10, 2024, that it does not believe that ACHP participation in the consultation to resolve adverse effects is needed. FRA and Amtrak sought public comments regarding Section 106 by posting the draft MOA on [regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov) and Amtrak's project website beginning December 11, 2024. No comments were received from the public during the 30-day comment period. FRA, SHPO, and Amtrak executed the MOA on March 21, 2025.

FRA filed the executed MOA with ACHP on March 21, 2025 (see Appendix B).

3.2. SECTION 4(F) OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1966

Pursuant to the requirements of Section 4(f), the EA included an assessment of potential Section 4(f) property impacts.

FRA has determined that the Preferred Alternative will require a Section 4(f) use of the following properties: the Amtrak Pelham Bay Railroad Bascule Bridge and the Pelham Bay Park (Publicly Owned Park).

The Section 4(f) use of the Pelham Bay Railroad Bascule Bridge is excepted from the requirement for Section 4(f) approval per 23 CFR § 774.13(a)(2). The Preferred Alternative will replace the existing historic bridge that is considered a railroad element for the purposes of 23 CFR 774.13(a)(2) and therefore meets the requirements of the Section 4(f) exception and will not require Section 4(f) approval.

For Pelham Bay Park, the Preferred Alternative will require permanent acquisition of 0.23 acres of parkland, a maintenance easement on 0.37 acres of parkland, and a temporary easement on 3.38 acres of parkland for a total of 3.98 acres of real property acquisition. Amtrak and FRA coordinated with NYCDPR, the Official with Jurisdiction (OWJ) over the Park, to identify a series of proposed measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts to the Pelham Bay Park to ensure a *de minimis* impact. The use of these areas within the Pelham Bay Park to construct and operate the Project will not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes that make the Park eligible for Section 4(f) protection. In addition, the total use of the Park will be a small portion of the total resource. Therefore, with consideration of the proposed mitigation, the FRA made a *de minimis* determination in accordance with 23 CFR 774.

The public was afforded the opportunity to review and comment on the effects of the Project on Pelham Bay Park by way of the EA public comment period and in-person public meeting. Following the public comment period, FRA informed NYCDPR, as the official with jurisdiction over Pelham Bay Park, of FRA's intent to make a *de minimis* finding. NYCDPR concurred in writing that the Project will not adversely affect the activities, features or attributes that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f) in a letter dated October 8, 2025 (see Appendix C).

3.3. SECTION 6(F) OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT

Pelham Bay Park received Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) funding in 1976 for the Orchard Beach Rehabilitation project. Easements in Pelham Bay Park for the Preferred Alternative will trigger LWCF parkland conversions. The total Section 6(f) property conversion for the Project is 3.98 acres. In accordance with the *Land and Water Conservation Fund State Assistance Program Federal Financial Assistance Manual* (Volume 72, effective October 1, 2023), a conversion of recreational use must be approved by New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) and the National Park Service (NPS), and replacement land will need to be provided. Amtrak, in conjunction with the NYCDPR, have coordinated in the identification of potential replacement properties in proximity to Pelham Bay Park. A potential suitable replacement property on City Island in the Bronx has been identified; Amtrak will continue coordination to identify other possible properties and to meet Section 6(f) conversion requirements.

Amtrak and FRA have coordinated with OPRHP, NPS, and NYCDPR to ensure the requirements under the LWCF Act will be met. In accordance with the LWCF Manual Chapter 8, Section F.3.g, an analysis of the potential environmental impacts to both the land to be converted and the replacement property will be prepared and submitted to OPRHP. Amtrak and FRA will coordinate through OPRHP to provide NPS with information for NPS to make their own NEPA determination following this FONSI identifying the Selected Alternative.

4. Coordination and Consultation

Amtrak conducted public and community outreach efforts for the Project, along with federal, state, and local agency coordination. Amtrak held over 20 meetings to inform the public, stakeholders, and agencies about project milestones and sought public and agency input. Amtrak created a website for the Project:

<https://www.amtrak.com/about-amtrak/new-era/infrastructure-projects/pelham-bay-bridge-replacement.html> to provide project updates throughout the environmental review process and later project phases. In May 2025, Amtrak distributed a fact sheet via email to a mailing list of elected officials, agencies, interested groups, and members of the public.

As part of the NEPA review process, FRA identified two agencies as Cooperating Agencies – U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) and U.S. Coast Guard (USCG). On April 26, 2023, Amtrak responded to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) request for cooperating agency status. Amtrak awarded EPA cooperating agency status. In addition, the following Participating Agencies were included in the NEPA review process: National Park Service; New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Federal Transit Administration; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; New York State Department of Conservation; and New York City Department of Parks and Recreation.

FRA and Amtrak provided USCG, USACE, and NYC Parks a 30-day comment period on the EA from April 3, 2025, to May 5, 2025. Additionally, the EA was posted and distributed for public comment for 30 days, from June 16 to July 17, 2025. The document was posted on regulations.gov and on Amtrak's project webpage, and hard copies were made available at publicly accessible facilities near the Project site (Bronx Borough President's Office, Pelham Bay Park Administrator's Office, Baychester Library, Pelham Bay Library, and the Co-op City-Riverbay Corporation Community Relations Department). After publication of the EA, Amtrak held an in-person public meeting on July 10, 2025, at the Co-op City Community Center to allow public comments on the EA.

5. Summary of Comments and Responses

All substantive comments received by July 17, 2025, are summarized in this section. Four comments were received during the EA public comment period. Original copies of each comment are provided in Appendix A.

Amtrak received comments on the draft EA from New York City Parks and USACE during the Cooperating Agency Review period. USCG reviewed and did not provide comments on the EA.

The following agency and individuals commented on the EA during the Public Comment Period:

1. United State Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), comments submitted via letter on July 17, 2025
2. Ronan Selby-Curran, comments submitted via comment card on July 10, 2025
3. Elisha G. Hunter, comments submitted via comment card on July 10, 2025
4. Mary Pearson, comments submitted via project website on July 18, 2025

Each comment is presented in full below, with a response to each. For ease of reading, each comment is divided into topic areas with corresponding responses.

Environmental Protection Agency

Comment #1. The EPA encourages the FRA to coordinate with relevant agencies such as EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to inform future planning efforts as the project proceeds. Coordination at the

earliest stages of project development and beyond would be beneficial as it allows for the identification and resolution of potential concerns and impacts, as well as potentially feasible alternatives.

Response #1. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is a cooperating agency in the NEPA process for the Pelham Bay Bridge Replacement project and FRA and Amtrak met with them multiple times during the development of the EA. Amtrak will continue to coordinate with USACE as design progresses as part of the permitting process.

Comment #2. Further details pertaining to the dredging activities associated with this project should be provided in the Final EA. This includes an outline or description of dredged materials management options, estimated volume of dredged material to be produced by the Preferred Alternative and from maintaining the new navigation channel, and plans for the disposal of contaminated materials. The handling of contaminated materials is particularly relevant as the Final EA indicates that there is a history of petroleum spills into the Hutchinson River and river sediment adjacent to the project site was found to be impacted with pesticides and metals. Additionally, the EPA encourages the consideration of beneficial use options for material management to the maximum extent possible.

Response #2. The extent of the dredging is limited to demolition and removal of the existing masonry piers at the existing bridge, demolition and removal of the foundations for the two towers adjacent to the existing bridge moveable span, rock demolition of any rock and removal of the rock and soil to allow widening the navigation channel to 100 feet. The estimated volume of material is 9,000 cubic yards. Before any dredging occurs, as described in Section 3.9.6 of the EA, a Phase II sampling investigation will be completed prior to construction and handling and disposal needs of dredged material will be determined at that time. Amtrak will consider beneficial use options, where appropriate.

Comment #3. The EPA acknowledges the Transit Noise and Vibration Impact and Abatement Technical Report, monitoring existing noise levels at representative sites, and noise abatement/mitigation measures including the four noise barriers incorporated as part of the Preferred Alternative. However, we note that the future build noise exposure level near 2025 Erskine Ave was determined to be the highest day-night average (Ldn) A-weighted decibel (dBA) rating within the moderate impact range (68 Ldn dBA; >68 Ldn dBA is categorized as severe) where the proposed noise barrier will terminate. Though the Final EA states that the noise barrier must terminate abruptly due to the Metro-North Railroad's future Co-op City Station platform, the EPA recommends that the temporary installation of noise abatement/mitigation measures be considered for this area due to the moderate impact determination and include an evaluation of these options.

Response #3. The installation of temporary noise wall for construction activities near 2025 Erskine Avenue, identified as R9 in the noise study documentation, would have minimal noise reduction benefit since daytime noise generated from construction activities will be about 64 dBA or 4 dBA below existing noise levels. The noise study was completed with the best available details of the proposed train station at the time. Amtrak will continue to ensure the noise reduction benefit to R9 is maximized once the train station design configuration is better defined.

Comment #4. The EPA acknowledges the early collaboration with National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service regarding Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the utilization of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife's (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation planning tool to obtain a list of Federally listed or proposed endangered and threatened species in the project area. To ensure compliance with ESA Section 7, the EPA recommends continued collaboration with the USFWS to assess the potential effects of the proposed work on species that are Federally listed or proposed, and to identify possible mitigation measures that could be implemented.

Response #4. FRA and Amtrak have coordinated with USFWS and intend to meet the requirements of Section 7 of the ESA, including the mitigation measures described in Section 3.8.6 of the EA.

Ronan Selby-Curran Comments (Individual)

Comment #5. If possible, I would consider adding some vegetation on the noise barriers.

Response #5. Vegetation on the noise barriers would only be for aesthetic purposes; it would not provide additional noise abatement. The design team may consider adding vegetation during later phases of design.

Comment #6. I would also ensure that only necessary lighting for navigation is included to reduce disruptions and impacts to birds, bats and insects.

Response #6. The details of the bridge navigation lighting will be in accordance the U.S. Coast Guard standards and apply to all bridges in the United States over navigable waterways. The lights will be attached to the underside of the bridge and to the fender system, in order to designate the location of the navigation channel. A green light marks the center of the channel and red lights mark the edges of the channel and the locations of the fenders. When the bridge is in the closed position, the lights attached to the underside of the bridge will be no higher than 35 feet above mean high water. When the bridge is in the open position, the lights at the end of the bascule leaf will be approximately 156 feet above mean high water. There will no other lighting along the length of the bridge except at the control house where there will be interior lights. FRA is not aware of any issues with bird, bat or insect impacts related to bridge navigation lights.

Note that the Project will remove the two tall transmission towers adjacent to the existing bridge.

Comment #7. I would see if pending community inputs/ opposition, if the noise barriers closer to residences could be raised to 7-8 feet to reduce noise impacts.

Response #7. The height of the noise barriers was determined to provide the necessary mitigation to the noise receptors. The design team may consider taller barriers in consultation with the community.

Elisha G. Hunter Comments (Individual)

Comment #8. Please make sure noise is abated to resident buildings. Please use the current noise reduction technology on train tracks including under track pads.

Response #8. Amtrak is committed to implementing sound barriers to mitigate the impacts to noise-sensitive receptors, including residences.

Mary Peason Comments (Individual)

Comment #9. Sound-level measurements. Projected sound-levels. At a public meeting in Co-op City, Bronx, NY, residents were told by Amtrak that railroad noise is mostly generated by the wheels on the tracks, and as such, a four-foot noise barrier will be sufficient to lower the noise by 5dBs. However, in the

area where horses are kept in Pelham Bay Park, a six-foot wall will be installed. I suggest a further and more current investigation and estimation of noise from train horns be explored to determine if a wall the height of the train would bring relief to both the horses and people in the area, especially since the daily number of trains passing by Section 5 of Co-op City (and the stables) is currently 51 and expected to increase to 161. I believe this updated study will indicate train horns are blown more frequently now than they were in the past when the EA was done in 2018. I suspect more horn blowing is due to the work in progress on the Metro-North Station and the substation.

Response #9. The higher noise barrier near the Bronx Equestrian Center is proposed because the tracks are moving closer to the receptor at that location. At the residential receptors at Co-op City, the tracks will be farther away with the construction of the new bridge. More frequent use of train horns during construction of either project, if necessary, would be temporary.

Comment #10. For outreach purposes, please include the word “railroad” in the name of the project to avoid confusion with the other two bridges in the vicinity. To Amtrak, the railroad bridge is simply called Pelham Bay Bridge, however, it is also referred to by other names. In Cultural Resources: Section 106 Findings & Historic Property Impacts page, the railroad bridge to be replaced is named Amtrak Pelham Bay Railroad Bascule Bridge. The bridge north of the railroad bridge is called Hutchinson River Parkway Drawbridge or Hutchinson River Parkway Bridge. The Pelham Bay (Railroad) Bridge is also known as the Amtrak Hutchinson River Bridge. The bridge south of Amtrak’s Pelham Bay Bridge is also called Pelham Bay Bridge in addition to being called Pelham Bridge as well as Shore Road Bridge. Again, on the same Cultural Resources page, that bridge to the south of the railroad bridge is listed as “Shore Road Bridge (AKA Pelham Bay Bridge).” At least in communication with the residents of Co-op City as well as the residents of City Island, using the term – Pelham Bay Railroad Bridge – would alleviate some confusion.

Response #10. Amtrak will ensure this is clear in future communication with Co-op City residents.

Comment #11. As a show of faith and to keep with the selling point that the new railroad bridge would improve the view, consider pledging to remove the abandoned barge that has remained stranded for a decade or more between the two Pelham bridges and may actually be in the intended path of the replacement bridge.

Response #11. The abandoned barge is outside of Amtrak’s right of way and is not within the alignment of the replacement bridge or the construction limits of disturbance. Removal of the abandoned barge falls outside the scope of the Pelham Bay Bridge Replacement project and would necessitate further evaluation of potential environmental impacts.

Comment #12. The name our community was spelled correctly on all of the posters put on display at the Pelham Bay Bridge Replacement Public Meeting on July 10, 2025. But elsewhere, such as on the flyer that served as an invitation to the meeting as well as on the post-meeting comments cards, Co-op City is spelled incorrectly.

Response #12. Amtrak will endeavor to ensure the correct spelling of Co-op City in future notices.

Comment #13. Lastly, do keep in mind the number of buildings in the affected area and people within earshot of your project. Tower building 34 has 384 apartments as do the other two adjacent Towers. Chevron building 31, at 100 and 120 Erskine Place, has 414 apartments as do the other two Chevrons in Section 5. The four Triple-Cores have a combined 2000 apartments. Please keep that 4,458 apartment total in mind when determining how to mitigate the construction noise as well as noise that will emanate from the finished Amtrak/Metro-North/PSA project. Our 10,000 people deserve your consideration.

Response #13. The noise methodology used considers the topography, line of sight and number of dwelling units in the assessment of impacts and mitigation measures.

6. FRA Finding of No Significant Impact

FRA has determined that the Project's Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2B) will have no significant adverse impacts on the human and natural environment and therefore an environmental impact statement is not warranted. FRA is making this FONSI based on the attached EA, the stipulations in the Section 106 MOA, mitigation measures in the Section 4(f) de minimis letter, table (above), and the comments offered by agencies, stakeholders, and the public on the record which have been independently evaluated by the FRA and determined to adequately and accurately discuss the need, environmental issues, and impacts of the proposed Project and appropriate mitigation measures. The EA provides sufficient evidence and analysis for FRA to determine that an environmental impact statement is not required for the Project as presented and to conclude its environmental review process with this Finding of No Significant Impact.

October 10, 2025

Date of Approval

STEPHANIE
BENNETT PEREZ-
ARRIETA

Digitally signed by STEPHANIE
BENNETT PEREZ-ARRIETA
Date: 2025.10.10 14:08:10
-04'00'

**Stephanie B. Perez
Chief, Environmental Review Division
Federal Railroad Administration**